THE

# ORDEAL.

N°. 8.] SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1809. [Vol. 1.

## MEETING *of the* FRIENDS *to the* EMBARGO AND COMPULSION.

Concluded from Page 108.

AFTER Mr. A—— the crier, had closed, the Hon. Mr. K—— called to order; he said there was no motion before the meeting although his friend Mr. A——n had kindly undertaken to second any one which might be made. He said that he was acquainted with no better method in this dilemma, than to make a motion himself. He then took a paper from his pocket containing a string of resolves 'ready cut and dried,' which he begged leave first to read, and then he said he intended to move for their adoption.

'WHEREAS STALL-FED BEASTS, enjoying sense and sensation without sentiment,' are best calculated for food, and the national government for laying the last embargo law is entitled to the *richest* proof of our esteem and support; and WHEREAS this land in consequence of the operation of the laws, is now 'flowing with milk and honey;' and at the 'most stupendous fabrick of human invention,'* 'the natural aspect of the country invites us, in a style superiour,' to support in our most effectual manner, our '*constitution*,' and the 'power of self government;' therefore, Resolved, in the first place, that we, a '*Host* of citizens, from various parts of this commonwealth,' will evince our support to the administration, by dining at the Exchange Hotel, kept by Mr. Hamilton, on the fourth day of March next.

Resolved, that James Madison has been chosen President of the United States [*three times three cheers*] for the four years *next afterwards* ensuing; and that he will pronounce his inaugural address on that day in Washington.

Resolved, that a committee of *ten* be appointed to compose appropriate toasts for the occasion, and that the RESOLUTIONS of the COUNTY OF NORFOLK, the PLYMOUTH REPUBLICAN MEMORIAL, and his honour the LIEUT. GOVERNOR'S *inimitable* SPEECH, be respectfully recommended, to supply them with metaphorical allusions and illustrations. [*tumultuous applause.*]

* We presume the author here alludes to the Exchange Hotel.

Resolved, that a committee be appointed to consult with our brethren of Norfolk, relative to the '*best stall-fed beasts*,' which can be had for the glorious occasion, and that Mr. Hamilton, *as master of the Hotel*, shall be one of the committee. [*Applause.*]

Resolved, that the genuine spirit of 76, will then have been exalted to 'its *highest proof*;' and that we shall then have made use of every kind of *provision* for the support of our constitution, and exercised all our restrictive energies, in convincing the Federalists that we have the 'power of self government.'

These resolves, sir, said Mr. K——, I hold to be perfectly appropriate, at this here time. By this vote, sir, we convince goverment, without entering into long arguments which only afford materials of ridicule and refutation to the Federalists, in the most decided terms, that we are pleased with the embargo laws.

1st. Because when men meet together in convivial parties, it is a proof they are *pleased*.

2d. Because the act of eating is a sure way of putting an end to argument, and *must be quite as convincing* to our rulers, as the *reasonings* of the various memorials, resolves and remonstrances which have been presented to Mr. Jefferson, and the legislature of this state. [*Hear him, hear him!*]

By this vote, I say, sir, said Mr. K——, we declare the embargo laws to be constitutional, necessary and expedient; that our ships are not rotting in our ports; that manufactures and agriculture are the support of the revenue; that the suppression of the publick documents was 'fair open and above board,' that the rejection of the British treaty by Mr. Jefferson, was just and proper; and that there is no partiality in our administration towards France. This vote, sir, declares, that a naval establishment is not congenial to the feelings of this people; that 'an attempt to rival the *oceanick* establishments of Europe, would be ridiculous, and in the first moments of collision the infant fleets of America would be COPENHAGENED by the gigantick armaments of England; [*rapturous expressions of approbation,*] that Great-Britain forces into her service, the *freemen of the world*, and makes them slaves; that the *coercion* of the embargo would have had complete effect, if it were not for our internal dissensions; that we are now a *united* people, and therefore it is soon to have a fair operation; that the Federalists are a *junto* and not Americans; that Mr. A—— has not grown fat; that the office of Mr. B——, is a trouble to him; that Mr. G——, the first merchant in New-England, is not making money by the embargo; [*great applause*] that I acted with good faith towards Mr. W—— of Wiscasset; that British gold and old tories are the only opposers of government. All this and a great deal more is declared by this vote; every thing which the present administration have done, and every thing which the new president intends to do, will be approved by it;

and every thing which the Federalists do or say is denounced: now, sir, as this is our most effectual weapon of defence, said Mr. K——, depriving our adversaries of the materials for reply, I move you, sir, that the RESOLVES I have just read, may be adopted.

Mr. B—— of Worcester, rose, he said, to speak to the motion; but a young Federalist from one corner of the room, who we suppose went there for no other purpose, than to 'fleer and scoff,' asked the chairman, if the motion had been duly seconded, for his part he could not perceive the intention of Mr. A——, to be considered as having seconded any motion which any gentleman might make, was in any respect in order; it might very well, he said, consist with the gentleman's ideas of propriety, but it did not accord with his own. 'Second the motion! second the motion!' immediately resounded from all parts of the meeting; the young man however, so far from being abashed, seemed highly delighted at contemplating the confusion of which he was himself the principal occasion. But he soon repented of his folly, for with a frown the venerable Mr. A—— rose, and remarked that he perceived an intention in some persons in the assembly, [*raising his voice*] whom he supposed to be old tories or British agents, [*thunders of applause*] who had come there with an intention to misinterpret or misrepresent the object of the meeting. The person who was last up, he had no knowledge of; but he was sure *he was no American*, from the opposition which he had made to the customary mode of proceeding, he must therefore be an alien, and deserved to be tarred and feathered, and driven from all *civilized* asemblies. He now perceived, however, that the young man had departed, and he therefore would spare further remark. Mr. B—gs then rose and observed, that as the motion was now regularly before the meeting, he should make a few remarks in favour of adopting the RESOLVES: and he thought if he spoke in favour of the last embargo law, and proved its constitutionality; that he should by that means show the necessity of eating dinner on the fourth of March; since it could not be proper to eat, drink and be merry on that occasion, unless they were satisfied of being right in supporting measures, which it was the avowed purpose of that dinner to approve. He said that he must admit this law did impair *some rights* secured to us by the constitution; but that yet the law was not unconstitutional; for, said he, is not the *elective franchise* still secure? Let our other rights be *invaded* if you please, provided our elective franchise is secure, there is no danger; the constitution is not hurt.* Besides, sir, can any one in this room suppose that a Jefferson, the god of the republicans, would

* We perfectly well recollect hearing the honourable member from Worcester make use of this argument in the house of representatives, and so attached did he appear to it, that he repeated it more than six times, in as many minutes.

injure the constitution? It is disgracing him, sir, to believe it. He may *truly* be called the saviour of his country; [*applause*] for if ever a nation was saved by a law, I believe, said Mr. B——, that the EMBARGO LAW is that law. He had examined the last law he said, but he could not discern how the constitution was particularly injured by it. It destroys our rights, it is said; but, sir, there are many laws of this commonwealth which hurt our rights; 'a man may buy a barrel of rum, sir, but he can't sell it without a licence,' [*loud satisfaction at this argument*] therefore the rights which are injured by the last embargo act have a parallel in our own laws. This, sir, removes one of the constitutional objections to this law, *and I dare say, sir, that the others are just as easily overthrown.** I contend, sir, that the *first* embargo law is just as unconstisutional as the *last;* because Mr. Giles proved in congress that the last contained no new doctrines. And if gentlemen make such violent objections now, why did they not do the same a year ago? [*Loud applause.*] Sir, I glory in the administration; we have now no *gag* law, though I begin to think we ought to have; no *alien* bills, no *land taxes*: we have to be sure a standing army; but then sir, there is no BRITISH TREATY; thank God, sir, we have got rid of *that* scourge. [*Three cheers given at this expression.*] The Federalists made that treaty, and our commerce might have been ruined by it, but, sir, Mr. Jefferson knew better; he would not make a treaty with the perfidious wretches who hold the reins of that government. And what is the consequence? Why, sir, he has irritated them, he has shewn them the American spirit; and though our commerce has been checked for a space, yet, sir, the time may come, when it will flourish more luxuriantly than ever. This is a compendious account of a speech which took up an hour and an half in delivery; but we believe we have faithfully given all the arguments which it contained. Mr. B—— concluded by hoping that the dinner resolves would be adopted. He said that many other things arose to view, but he was obliged to close his observations.

The chairman then put the question, and it passed unanimously. [*Here the audience were in rapture, and they applauded by huzzas, clapping of hands, and throwing up of hats.*] The moderator was about to adjourn the meeting, when the cry of 'grog, give us some grog!' was heard in every part of the room. The heads of the meeting immediately consulted, and at length determined it would be best to let the people have as much as they wanted for the sake of *quietness.* The landlord, therefore, soon furnished them with several *buckets* of '*Brandy Toddy,*' on which they regaled themselves for upwards of an hour; and considering all circumstances it had no very ill effects. The meet-

* The precise reasoning of this member in the house of representatives.

ing was dissolved in great good humour the people departed in excellent spirits; but the heads of the assembly staid to supper for the purpose of more efficient consulation.

## RIGHT *of* SEARCH *for* SEAMEN *in Merchant Ships.*

THE claims of our government on this head, have been broached and adhered to with so much pertinacity, that they have very justly been considered the principal impediment to an adjustment of our differences with Great-Britain, and in truth as the real *origin* of the difficulties, under the weight of which we are now pressed to the last state of endurance. It would be natural to suppose, that amidst all our clamours for redress of the British invasions of the rights of the American flag in merchant ships, that there could not be found on their side the least whisper of any other right but that of power; and indeed Mr. Madison in his letter to Mr. Munroe, of January 5, 1804, seems to entertain this idea. He asserts unequivocally in the outset of his discussion of our rights in this particular; that 'nowhere will she' (Great-Britain) '*find an exception to this freedom of the seas and of neutral flags, which justifies the taking away of any person, not an enemy, in military service, found on board a neutral vessel.*'

This broad assertion, equally destitute of truth and sincerity, we will oppose by the following instance, directly in point:

'Soon after the peace of 1654, a Dutch man of war convoying a fleet of merchant ships, was met by an English man of war in the Downs. The English searched the merchantmen; and the affair was discussed by the States under two heads; the search of ships of war, and the search of merchantmen, the former question appearing to have been suggested by the latter, and the presence of the Dutch man of war. The result of their deliberations was a resolution, that 'the refusal to let merchantmen be searched could not be persisted in;' but respecting the other point, they came to the following determination. 'That, in conformity with their High Mightinesses' instructions, taken in respect to the searching of ships of war, and especially those of September 1627, Nov. 1648, and Dec. 1649, it is thought good, and resolved, that all captains and other sea-officers, that are in the service of this state, or cruising on commission, shall be *anew*, strictly commanded, told, and charged, that they shall not condescend to no commands of any foreigners at sea, much less obey the same; neither shall they any ways permit that they be searched; nor deliver, nor suffer to be taken out of their ships, any *people* or other things.'* (Thurloe. II. 503.)'

* Edinburgh Review, p. 20, No. 21.

Here the Dutch, as expressly as a nation could do, have renounced the principle of the protection of the neutral flags in merchant ships. But it may be said, the decision only referred to *enemies property or articles contraband of war* and not to *persons*. This idea, however, will be removed, when we consider the *whole* determination of the states, for in the decision in respect to ships of war, they expressly refer to the *object* of the search, and affirm, 'nor suffer to be taken out of their ships any *people* or other things.' The converse of the proposition is equally true according to their own principles, that they could not persist in refusing to 'let *merchant* vessels be searched' for '*people* or other things.'

## LIES, MISREPRESENTATIONS, &c.

### LIES.

**The embargo was laid on to preserve our ships and merchandize; it was also thought by *some* that it might operate as a measure of coercion. It did save our property; but the evasions of the law and the Spanish revolution prevented its effects as a coercive act. *Monitor.***

THE falsehood contained in this quotation, results from the attempt to show that only *some* of the democrats viewed the embargo as a *coercive* measure. Now it is well remembered, that *generally* throughout the country and in congress, the friends of the administration have declared it to be such. Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Giles, Mr. Nicholas, and we believe every democratick paper throughout the United States have maintained the policy of the measure under that idea. Indeed the author of the paragraph was himself, originally, a believer in the coercive branch of the system, since he immediately attributes the *failure* of this part, to evasions of the laws at home, and the revolution in Spain. We have thus refuted this assertion, because we have no intention of suffering the friends of this pernicious policy to shrink from their original ground of defence. If they are allowed to say to-day, that only *some* republicans 'thought it *might* operate as a measure of coercion,' to-morrow they will limit them to a *few*, and afterwards in regular progression, it may be said that *none* ever sincerely believed its efficacy. Thus this most pernicious defence, will be frittered away; and when the people, hereafter, want to discover the authors and defenders of such ridiculous dogmas, for the sake of punishing them as they deserve, they will be unable to penetrate their concealment. It is the right of the people to execute the decisions of justice; it is *ours* to detect the guilty and drag the offenders to the bar of judgment.

'The keeping on the embargo *till we were prepared for war, could only be for a very short time.*' *Monitor.*

Here are two lies directly in the teeth of fact. The government have not made, nor have they undertaken to make any *efficient* preparations for war; any preparations, against either Great-Britain or France that do not disgrace the term, WAR. Where is there *a navy?* or where the *fortifications?* or even an *army* calculated to be of any efficacy against either of those belligerents? The second lie, contained in the above assertion is, that the embargo could remain on 'only a *very short* time.' This very short time, is now upwards of a year; and the object to attain which, this short time only was required, that is, '*till we are prepared for war*' is not *now* effected, nor are we making any rapid strides towards it. But on the other hand, the losses we are every month sustaining by the continuance of the present policy, would, we have no doubt, more than pay for the establishment of six ships of the line.

'The administration designed to raise it, [the embargo] but they did not want to leave the country stark naked, without means of resisting a foreign invading enemy.' *Monitor.*

Does this writer mean to assert that we are *now* in a situation of resisting a foreign invading enemy? If so, then we say the assertion is false. If the reason the administration did not raise the embargo was their not being willing to *leave the country stark naked*, why not prepare for war at the period of *adopting* the measure. The truth is, that 'as the administration have *not* provided means for resisting a foreign enemy, the presumption is they did *not* design to raise it.' What was done in congress at the time the embargo was established, that might be called *preparation* for war? Positively nothing but the raising of 6000 men, a number absolutely ridiculous, when considered as a means of defence against invasion. But not a single additional dollar appropriated for the naval department. The best means of defence, a defence in which all parties would have united, was neglected and despised. So far from truth is the assertion, that *government only wanted time to prepare for war*, that some Federalists who were originally advocates for the embargo policy, on a similar ground, are now and have been for nine months, the most violent opposers of it, since they have not been able to discern in the administration any intention to place the country in a respectable state of defence.

'It is worthy of observation, that not a man who openly advocated the resolutions (of Boston,) has one shilling in the funds which will be hazarded in the controversy.' *Chronicle, Feb 6.*

This lie it is the more necessary to expose, as it is made with such unblushing effrontery. The piece from which the extract was taken,

was probably the production of a gentleman in office, and we suppose he means by the expression, 'openly advocate,' that no person who *spoke* in favour of the resolutions, had any property in the funds. Now this is evidently not the apparent intention of the paragraph; it manifestly endeavours to convey, substantially, the idea that the advocates of the resolutions were destitute of any interest in maintaining the credit of government stock; than which no assertion was ever more scandalously false. Conceding, however, the most rigid meaning of the expression 'openly advocated,' we still say that there could not be a more 'open' avowal of a man's principles than an *open* vote, before the body of his fellow citizens. But to deprive the Loan Officer, or the author of the paragraph, of any excuse for the assertion, we now affirm that it is *not true* that '*not a man* who *spoke* in favour of the resolutions had a shilling in the funds.' We know to the contrary; and if necessary it can be established by legal testimony.

Such lies as these circulate in the country undisputed; and the Federalists by suffering them to remain unanswered, really commit a negative crime on the morals of the community.

'While *three thousand seamen* are held in bondage by Britain.'

*Chronicle, Feb.* 6.

'The conduct of Great-Britain, in the impressment of our seamen, adds a deeper die to the injuries inflicted upon us by her. Thousands of our seamen are confined on board her ships of war. *Chronicle, Feb.* 16,

This is an assertion generally circulated, and all the democratick papers echo it with exultation. But we think it comes very ungracefully from the advocates of the embargo system, which has *driven our seamen into* this very bondage of which we hear such pathetick complaints. The fact is, that those American seamen who are now forcibly detained in the English service, will unquestionably be discharged, on a proper application made for them. And as to such as enlist *voluntarily* we cannot complain of the British, but our own government. We venture to say without risk of contradiction, that there are not *three hundred* American seamen held in *bondage*, or against their inclination in the British service, at this moment; and that those can have their discharge when properly claimed. According to Mr. Madison's letter to Mr. Munroe, on *the subject* of impressment, dated 5th January, 1804, it appears that out of 2,056 cases of impressed seamen of *all* nations, between the month of June, 1797, and September, 1801, for whom claims were preferred, that 1142 WERE DISCHARGED; 102 were *British* seamen, and 805 were left for further proof.

In his letter of instructions to Messrs. Munroe and Pinckney, dated May 17, 1806, the Secretary of State alludes to the letter just referred to 'as being still applicable to a great proportion of the matter now committed to their joint negociations.' We may hence conclude that

the evil is by no means so dreadful as is generally supposed, particularly when it is considered that the British ministers assured Messrs. Munroe and Pinckney, Nov. 7, 1806, that 'their government gave at that time no cause of offence to the United States by impressments, and that the American ministers might be satisfied, it would continue to pursue the same policy;' and in an official note presented by Lords Holland and Aukland, they give Messrs. Munroe and Pinckney the most positive assurances that '*instructions have been given** and shall be repeated and enforced, for the observance of the greatest caution in the impressing of British seamen; and that the strictest care shall be taken to preserve the citizens of the United States from any molestation or injury; that immediate and prompt redress shall be afforded upon any representation of injury sustained by them.' Mr. Madison, in his note of Feb. 3, 1807, resorts to equivocation in endeavouring to remove the assertion 'that no recent causes of complaint had taken place' in respect to this subject; he roundly asserts, without the least *proof*, that impressments never were more numerous, and 'however the language of Mr. Lyman's book's may countenance this errour,' the secretary can not say, but he undertakes to assert that 'he thinks it *probable even there*,' that 'the means of correcting it may be found.' Messrs. Munroe and Pinckney accorded in sentiment with the British ministry; and since the Chesapeak disaster, which unfortunately occurred soon after the above official communications, we have heard of no instances of *impressments* of American seamen: but on the contrary, many such sailors have been discharged from the British service.

## CALUMNIES.

'The real object of this party is to separate the United States, and excite *Rebellion and Civil War*, for the purpose of establishing a *Monarchy*, under the pretence of a Northern confederacy, or to force us into a destructive war with the continent of Europe, consequently a fatal alliance with the corrupted monarchy of Britain, 'whose embrace is death.'' *Chronicle, Feb.* 16.

It is almost useless to refute this calumny. The object of the Federalists has always been to *maintain* the laws and the constitution; that of the democrats to evade both. The embargo laws were either constitutional or not; if not, the Federalists are supported by the constitution in endeavouring to obtain legal redress. Laws which are unconstitutional are not binding; and the legislature have declared these laws to be thus invalid. But there never has been known *any thing like a northern confederacy*, to force government into a war with France; though there are many wise politicians who consider the measure highly just and expedient. Yet such assertions spread as widely as if they

* Such orders were issued about this time.

were true; and too often remain uncontradicted, under the vain hope that they would carry their refutation in their absurdity. But it is too late to indulge such fancies; when we observe grave senators in congress, yet advocate the EMBARGO policy on the ground of PRECAUTION, though its operation is precicely the reverse, we must no longer conceive any intimation too absurd for systematick refutation.

## CONTRADICTION.

'If the *minority* must rule the majority, there is an end of the constitution.'
*Chronicle.*

This is a republican impossibility; but if applied to the State government, where is democratick *modesty?* The majority cannot be ruled, the moment what *was* the majority becomes *ruled* it is no longer such; because it must be overpowered by counteracting *votes*. There is no such thing therefore as a majority being *ruled* by the minority, or the constitution being ended in consequence. The constitution however *can* be ended, by other means. If our unalienable, inherent rights are destroyed, the constitution is ended; and if COMMERCE is annihilated, so far as the provisions of the constitution which were made for its protection are rendered nugatory, it is ended.

## MISREPRESENTATION.

'Men may very honestly differ on these points; but there never would have been any difficulty at all if it had not been for the contrivances of the Essex Junto.' *Monitor.*

So much for veracity. The Essex Junto we should imagine would be infinitely obliged to the editor of the Monitor, to particularize the contrivances which have had such a wonderful effect. It is well known the Essex Junto *oppose* the difficulties, which it seems have been occasioned by their own contrivances, so that they must have been very shallow brained politicians. Now, such men as have occasioned so much distress, whose plans existed before we had met with any disaster, and who have so fully succeeded in their designs, cannot be very foolish in their schemes, however they may be wicked.

## DEMOCRACY, vs. DEMOCRACY.

'Resolved, that the real causes of our present embarrasments are not the embargo, or any measures of our own government, but are *wholly* owing to the unjust and oppressive conduct of Great-Britain and France.'
*Chronicle, Feb.* 16.

### ANSWER.

'The evils which we as a people do this moment experience, are in some measure owing to the publick and private machinations of our domestick enemies.' *Chronicle, Feb.* 16.

'But there never would have been any difficulty at all if it had not been for the contrivances of the Essex Junto.' *Monitor.*

## THE STAGE.

Next came the legion, which our *winter* Bayes
*From alleys here and there* contriv'd to raise;
Projecting schemes the dreary months to cheer,
And with wild folly tire the listening ear.

WE are generally willing to allow the propriety of scrutiny on the performances of the stage; but do not deem it incumbent on us to take up much room in descanting on the merits of the *complaints* of managers, or the personal *conduct* of performers. As far, however, as the publick is evidently connected with such enquiries, we are ready to permit any remarks to be published, which can have a tendency to remedy the evils complained of: but our correspondent ALPHA, who is so much incensed at the behaviour and situation of certain performers on Mr. Bernard's benefit night, and has communicated his very severe and caustick remarks for publication, is respectfully informed that the length of his piece far exceeds any limits which we can reasonably assign to a subject so notoriously *stale* in fact, and which would be so *unprofitable* to discuss. There are some of his observations, however, not undeserving of regard.

ALPHA, it seems, is fond of the theatre, but had been prevented by sickness from attending any performance, until particularly induced by the attraction of Mr. Bernard's benefit; he complains bitterly of his disappointment. He says he had heard that the managers had made many complaints of the times, which prevented their receiving any encouragement from the publick; he had sympathized with them in their misfortunes; but *now* the opinion of ALPHA is, that they must have received infinitely greater support than they had any right or pretension to expect. 'For,' says he, 'if such actors as Messrs. Taylor, Johnson, Robertson, Barnes, Morgan and Vining are cast to some of the most important characters in the scene; if Mr. Caulfield is allowed repeatedly to offend, indeed to insult the audience, as he did on Wednesday evening; if during the whole season, there has hardly been performed an excellent or legitimate comedy;' but some ill-digested and miserably written productions, as the Blind Girl, the World, Begone Dull Care, the Wood Dæmon, and The Pilgrims have been forced upon the publick to tire their patience and pervert their taste, it is utterly ridiculous to make complaints so entirely destitute of any stability for a foundation.' He complains that Mr. Bernard should have treated his friends on his benefit night with a production of Dibdin, which had nothing but musick to recommend it. But even that could not save it in London, and it was generally condemned, as being perfectly flat and uninteresting, and as possessing neither wit in dialogue, truth in character, nor ingenuity in plot.

It is the cause of frequent observation, too, he further remarks, that the principal business of the season has been confined to Messrs. Bernard, Dickenson, Mills, and Mrs. Woodham; the two latter of whom have been unfairly treated, as to their professional reputation. They have been so often required to take principal parts almost at a moment's warning; to play every night during the season, and not uncommonly in the longest characters, both in play and farce, that they have seldom had an opportunity to impress the *words* upon their memory, much less to give life, soul and vigour in the utterance, to the sentiment and expression.

## MR. FENNELL'S READINGS.

ANOTHER correspondent complains of Mr. Fennell's bills of fare: which he says remind him of the epicure, who dined on *pork and beans* one day, and *beans and pork* the next. Mr. Fennell gives us *John Gilpin* and the *Maid of the Moor* one evening, and the *Maid of the Moor* and *John Gilpin* the next. It would certainly be an improvement in the present course, to have the same pieces in the *same order*, *every* evening. This method would save the printers much trouble, as there would be no occasion for displacing their types; and the audience, as they would not then *expect* any thing *new*, would not be disappointed (as they must be at present) in *finding* nothing new.

The pages of Shakespeare, Milton, Young, Brooke, Thomson, and others, contain an inexhaustible variety of passages excellently adapted to publick reading. The Iliad and Odyssey, Ossian, Madock, Marmion, &c. afford episodes of exquisite beauty, and susceptible of the highest improvement from a forcible and judicious reader. With such resources, a repetition of the same pieces, when they are not to be committed to memory, is certainly unnecessary.

Is Mr. Fennell insensible that he possesses no talents for comedy, or light satire? and that they cannot be supplied by critical study? It is true, he might be successful in speaking the Satire of Juvenal; and he is not deficient in the 'description of a fop:' but this species of composition partakes of all the qualities of heroick poetry; indignation, contempt, anger, are passions, which though found in comedy and satire, are entirely distinct from humour. We therefore think, that the introduction of humorous compositions into Mr. Fennell's reading, is a custom which would be 'more honoured in the breach than the observance.'

## ADVERTISEMENTS.

### ☞ CARD.

THE beautiful young lady, who unfortunately slipped down upon the ice, and dropped her garter in the Mall, last Wednesday, is desired not to make herself uneasy, as the gentleman, who witnessed the fact and picked up the garter, is upwards of fifty, and most religiously promises that the *exposure* shall go no further.

### FOUND

Out, by the administration, that the British are not to be frightened by the embargo, and that the Orders of Council will still continue, until our temper be changed.

### WANTS,

ARGUMENT, Mr Giles's Speech;
VIRTUE and WISDOM, Mr. Jefferson's administration;
MEANING, Honestus' essays in the Chronicle;
WIT, the Journal of an English traveller in the Monthly Anthology;
LIBERALITY, the Panoplist; and,
ENCOURAGEMENT, *most new publications*.

### THE THEATRE,

This season, has a great many wants. The PLAYS want *attraction*, the ACTORS want *talents*, the MANAGERS want *liberality*, and the PUBLICK want *discrimination*.

### NOTICE.

If the writer of certain paragraphs in certain papers, who, according to his opinion, is possessed of the very *first talents* in the country, and is eminently well calculated to guide the chariot of Phœbus, is now in want of employ, we shall be happy to publish some of his lucubrations; provided his meaning be rendered more evident, by numerous Italick phrases and capitals, and provided his wit shall depend upon the *printer*, as well as himself.

### THINGS TAKEN.

The ENGLISH NAVY have taken *nothing*, because there is nothing to take;
The FRENCH have taken *Madrid*;
The UNITED STATES ARMY have taken *cotton-wool*;
CONGRESS have taken *time*;
The LEGISLATURE OF MASSACHUSETTS have taken good *council*,
And the LIEUT. GOVERNOUR has taken *umbrage*.

LOST

In Federal-street, near the Theatre, a bundle of love-letters, some beginning, *My dere letel angel*, others, *my sweet Mary*, and others, *my love;* they are written in various hands, from various lovers, to one lady, and whoever has found and will return them to Cambridge College, shall receive a satisfactory reward.

MISSING,

Supposed to be stolen, the modesty of Miss S——. It is presumed to be in the possession of some *vulgar* female, or perhaps *quaker*, as the former owner has enquired of all *her* female acquaintances respecting it, who deny having any knowledge of the article; and indeed she confesses she cannot discover any traces of it among them; but as the commodity is now very *scarce*, and Miss S—— is anxious to recover what she has lost, she hereby offers her most heart-felt thanks to any person who will direct her the way to obtain it again. She offers the above reward for the *modesty without the thief;* but if the purloiner can be discovered, she will be willing to afford additional remuneration.

## FAST DAY.

IT is curious to mark the distinctions which always exist between sincerity and hypocrisy, they both have virtue on the exteriour, but the garb of one is torn, and you can discover the hypocrite through the tatters, while the other is whole and free from disguise. We think we can discover in the Lieut. Governour's letter to the senate and house of representatives, many of these peep holes, and through them the deceiver which it is intended to conceal. The meaning of his Honour is enveloped in an obscurity of expression, which the light of understanding which he undoubtedly intended should enlighten it, is hardly sufficient to dispel it.

He remarks that 'from an anxiety at learning yesterday, that Mrs. Lincoln was very sick,' he should not accept the invitation of the legislature to attend publick worship on the day they had appointed for a Fast. His honour then takes occasion to observe that as 'the spirit of the times might mistake a non-acceptance of the invitation, for a *proof of infidelity*,' he confesses 'a belief in the christian system.' He then proceeds with an intimation that the *Fast* may have a bad effect on the community, by inducing the people (but by no means hinting an application to the legislature) for party purposes, to get up conventions in the country under the *name of Fasts*, for the purpose of creating uneasiness, jealousy and insubordination in respect to their rulers.

The first idea which struck us upon the perusal of this singular letter was, his Honour's quickness to suspect that he might be suspected of infidelity. He then, like a true hypocrite, proceeds to *profess*, but refuses to act. His professions are such, however, as leave very little doubt on the mind of any person possessed of common understanding, that they are only plausible covers of his real opinion, and can be removed at pleasure. His Honour's belief in the *christian system* may mean no more, than that it is a good political measure to maintain such a system, but is in fact no declaration of a sincere belief in the essential doctrines of christianity. But even if it were the case, why take for granted that the people would suppose his non-acceptance of the invitation '*a proof* of infidelity ?' was not his *ostensible excuse sincere* ? or did he think it was not sufficient ? Had he not declared his belief of the *christian system* at his inauguration, as a fundamental requisite for his qualification, and that too, under all the solemnity of an oath ? But we beg pardon, he well knew the hypocrisy which had disgraced *other* inaugurations, and might reasonably conclude the people could place no reliance on similar professions of belief ; and as to an oath, we know its bond is loosened and dissolved by the breath of infidelity.

But after all, if the excuse which his Honour assigned was sufficient to authorize his non-acceptance of the invitation ; and if the occasion was too solemn to admit the operation of party feelings ; then the letter of his Honour is *really* chargeable with the same crime which he only *presumes* the publick may be guilty of ; because he employs it for party purposes at the very time when he is engaged in a concern, which he deems of more importance, than publickly to worship God.

The whole of this letter indicates uncommon hypocrisy, and an intolerance of party asperity ; and daily experience is affording us abundant proof of the validity of the assertion.

## UNCONSTITUTIONAL CONDUCT OF LIEUTENANT GOVERNOUR LINCOLN.

THE crimes of the general government are so alarming, that the people view the conduct of inferiour officers with indifference or contempt ; but the Romans were in as much danger from the *horse* of Caligula, which was elevated to the first office in the state, as from the tyrant himself. What terms of reproach are strong enough to represent the last attempt of the Lieut. Governour to control the people, by a military force, at the hazard of violating the constitution and the laws of the land ? What colours are dark enough for representing his image ? what masterly hand shall we find to give the characteristick touches ?

Here is an instance of flagrant injustice which does not require the aid of exposition. Is there any tool of the administration profligate enough to deny that the late conduct of the Lieut. Governour, in giving orders to the military was unconstitutional? His giving orders at any rate, at the instigation of the Secretary at war, was contrary to law; the manner in which he *directed* them betrayed the guilt of his intention, and confirms his own conviction of the crime; and the secrecy, with which the whole business was conducted, blackens his character with a stain so infamously indelible, that all the waters of Lethe cannot eradicate or weaken it.

The most arbitrary governments suffer the administration of the laws to take its regular course; if the rights of the people are invaded by their provisions, no new rights are overthrown by the execution of them. But the Lieut. Governour of a republican state improves upon the most tyrannical doctrines; as if to confound our revenge by multiplying crimes. In his opinion the military shall not only control the civil power, which is one breach of the constitution; but shall be made to control it by secret orders, and on no sufficient authority, which is another. We are happy to observe the spirited RESOLVE of the committee of the house of representatives, on the subject; and we hope the charge may hereafter be made an article of impeachment against Governour Lincoln: we publish the resolve for the honour of American spirit, the honour of the committee for reporting, and the house for adopting it; and for the purpose of extending, in some small degree, the disgrace of the executive, and make the impression perpetual.

'Resolved, That in the opinion of this house, the said military orders of the first of Feb. inst. issued by his honour LEVI LINCOLN, Esq. Lieutenant Governour and Commander in Chief of this Commonwealth, are irregular, illegal and inconsistent with the principles of the constitution; tending to the destruction of military discipline, an infringement of the rights, and derogatory to the honour of both officers and soldiers; subversive of the military system, and highly dangerous to the liberties of the people.

All which is respectfully submitted.

ISAAC MALTBY, per order.'

## THEATRICAL JUDGMENT.

*Supposed to have been written by an unsuccessful author.*

MAY I approach unto the boxes, pray,
And there search out a judgment on the play?
In vain, alas! should I attempt to find it;
Fair ladies SEE a play, but never MIND it.